#### Interpretation: the aff must specify how the handgun ban is enforced in a delineated text in the AC.

#### Violation: this isn’t specified in the aff.

#### The standard is weighing ground: generalized debate about without enforcement spec is impossible.

#### A) it’s not clear what you defend-handgun bans can take many different forms.
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So the affirmative is a ban on handgun ownership. It is very rare, almost unheard of, for a government to ban the ownership of something a huge number of people already own. This is because it raises immense logistical difficulties to ban something people already have, for two reasons. First, it is much harder to know how many people own something, and which people do, than it is to know how many people purchase something. Individuals that own something may have never bought it or may have acquired it via extralegal means. Second, the mechanism or prohibiting ownership is more complex than simply making sure people can’t buy anything in the future. How can the government ensure people do not have something? Does it have to enter private residences and raid basements? Can it trust all persons to turn in their item at the nearest police station at their earliest convenience? Need the government compensate persons for their property? What is the strategy for noncompliance? For these reasons, affirmatives must be built to accommodate implementation-based difficulties. It is not feasible for the affirmative to simply assume that handguns vanish in their world. They must describe a scenario for ensuring that their ban on ownership actually decreases ownership. This is more realistic, and also gives the negative the ground they deserve!

#### B) race Ks and DAs about differential enforcement between different groups and racist targeting depend on what implementation you defend and how involved police offers are.

#### C) there’s no agency that has the duty of disarming the citizenry-aff advocacy is entirely hypothetical until you explain who does the aff.
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Who would enforce handgun disarmament and with what degree of vigor? National Alcohol Prohibition was enforced by a small number of US. Treasury Department agents and by state and local police departments. Criminal justice and organized crime scholar Humbert S. Nelli writes that “Prohibition overburdened the criminal justice system and undermined respect for the nation’s law.” Another author recalled that “organization and methods . . . were hopelessly inadequate.”20 Professor McBain of Co- lumbia Law School wrote in 1928 that “the large-liquor drinking public has been indifferent to, if not positively in favor of, the corruption that helps to keep the stimulating stream flowing without interruption . . . the [police] force from the beginning has been thoroughly spoils-ridden.”21 In many cities, the police were contemptuous of alcohol prohibition and did not enforce it; corruption flourished. History has repeated itself with the contemporary drug war. After the Supreme Court’s decision in Printz, rejecting federal authority to order state and local officials to conduct background checks, National Handgun Prohibition might have to be a completely federal program.22 What kind of a federal enforcement agency would be needed to investigate and deter unlawful handgun possession? Currently, most illegal handguns are seized as a consequence of street or car stops made by local law en- forcement agents; a frisk reveals the gun.23 Routine car and street stops are not the province of federal agents, who lack general street-level policing authority and experience. Perhaps BATF could be expanded into a super nationwide street-level police agency with tens of thousands of new agents? Such a move would have to overcome the opposition of the NRA, gun owners, some members of Congress, and others who excoriate BATF agents as “jack-booted minions.”\* It would also have to overcome those who oppose expanding federal power and expending a great deal of federal funds. Undoubtedly, there would be opposition and resistance from fringe elements, who for years have warned of a colossal and despotic federal government. The number of militia groups would probably grow, with the potential for Waco-type standoffs and shootouts.24

#### Three impacts here:

#### A) Debatability-there is no aff advocacy, there is no way to determine what impacts matter in the round. We don’t have an agreed upon framework for any kind of debate to happen. Controls the link to all voters-we cannot engage in effective argumentation if the round is irresolvable.

#### B) Stable advocacy-I’m deterred from reading my best offense because I don’t know if it will link to the aff’s specific implementation, that’s real abuse not potential. Key to fairness and education-if you’re shifty then I can’t engage in the aff.

#### C) Policy education-we don’t get to debate about the specifics of the aff’s mechanisms if you don’t clarify, no way to weigh between whether the plan is a good idea because nobody knows what links. This is the best form of education since we have to know about current events to seem smart in the real world.

#### Specifying in a plan text is better than cross-ex:

#### 1. there are multiple things you need to spec under my interp-having to clarify questions wastes minutes of cross-ex time that could be used understanding your case and setting up 1NC strategies.

#### 2. nobody flows CX, means the debates become unverifiable. 1AC plan text is key—I know exactly what to link to and there’s no possibility for a shift.

#### 3. most of my strategic decisions happen during the aff and cross-ex—shifting during CX kills nine out of my thirteen minutes of prep.